

REMARKS

This Amendment is responsive to the Final Office Action mailed June 16, 2005. Pending Claims 1-5 and 7-13 remain rejected. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

DRAWINGS

The undersigned gratefully acknowledges that the drawings filed on October 5, 2001 are accepted by the Examiner.

SPECIFICATION

Minor amendments have been made to the specification at Paragraph [0019] to correct typographical errors.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-5 and 7-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Li et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,473,599). Again, for the reasons provided in the previous response, this rejection is most respectfully, yet strenuously traversed.

Initially, the Examiner will note that very minor clarifying language has been added to independent Claim 1 and independent Claim 8.

The language added to Claim 1 more particularly clarifies that a "packet" filter is used to prevent the receipt of advertisement from a new router, which is a router other than the primary router or the backup router, regardless of a preference value

advertised by said the router. This language makes it clear that the method called for in Claim 1 does not provide for a new router entering the network and simply advertising itself as the default router. Rather, a packet filter is used with the host that allows only pre-designated routers to send advertisements to the host that indicate to the host that a new router is now the default router. This eliminates “man-in-the-middle” style attacks by an unauthorized router entering the network and simply advertising a higher preference value than an existing default router already active on the network. The language added at the end of Claim 8 is intended to highlight this feature of the method claimed in Claim 8.

Again, Li et al. does not appear to disclose or suggest the above-described feature of preventing “man-in-the-middle” style attacks on a network. Again, with reference to Columns 11 and 12, a scenario is explained by which a re-entering router may assume the role of the active router within a standby group. From this text, it appears that a new router re-entering the standby group may itself determine if it is programmed to send a “coup” message to “preempt” an active router. It appears that this is accomplished by the new re-entering router determining whether the active router in its standby group has a lower priority than itself (Column 12, Lines 3-10). If so, the new re-entering router then determines whether it is configured to preempt; and, if so, then sends a “coup” message to the active router.

Again, Li et al. would appear to allow a new router entering a standby group to potentially advertise itself as the active router, provided it is able to advertise that it has a higher priority than the present active default router. Such a scenario, with the method and apparatus of the present invention, still would not allow a new router

entering the network to take over as the default router. This is because of the packet filtering used at each host. The packet filtering is configured to pass only advertisements from pre-authorized routers operating on the network. Thus, in the scenario presented by Li et al., if a new router was to enter the network in the present invention, and then attempt to advertise itself as the default router simply by transmitting a higher priority advertisement than the presently performing default router, such as advertisement would not be recognized because of the packet filters associated with each seat electronics box 20a, 22a and 24a (Figure 1 of the present application). Therefore, it still appears that Li et al. suffers from the fundamental shortcoming of enabling a router entering the network to advertise itself as the highest priority router, and thereby take control of the network by taking over from the presently active router.

In view of the foregoing, and also the amendments to independent Claims 1 and 8, it is believed that these claims presently clearly define over Li et al.

Similarly, independent Claim 5 specifically calls out the step of using a packet filter with the host to prevent receipt of advertisement from a router that is not pre-authorized to act as a primary router. Accordingly, it is believed that this claim also clearly defines over Li et al.

Independent Claim 11 includes language similar to Claim 5, which makes clear that a filter is used on the host to restrict certain types of advertisements from routers. Again, this step does not appear to be shown or suggested in Li et al.

For the foregoing reasons, withdrawal of the rejections based on Li et al. is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 7, 2005

By: 
Mark D. Elchuk, Reg. No. 33,686

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDE/lf-s

G:\melchuk\7784\00001-000199\000194\Amendment AF.doc